

ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>James S> Dielschneider

<ADDRESS1>815 First Avenue, No 161

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>Seattle

<STATE>WA

<ZIP>98104

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>415 749 0985

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>MrJSDvc@attglobal.net

<TEXT>While and owner and Chairman of my own company, I recognized the need to help those of limited means to maintain telephone access. The cost was minor in our company in context of the thousands of dollars every month in our phone bills.

Under the flat fee proposal you are considering, people who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. In other words, low-volume and primarily residential customers would bear the same universal service fund burden as a high-volume residential or business customers. This is unfair!

I use my wireless phone for safety, security and convenience. I don't want to lose these benefits so that big businesses can pay less than their fair share. I urge you to reject the proposal to move the USF collection system to a flat-fee.

Keep the USF Fair!

Sincerely,

James S Dielschneider
815 First Avenue, No 161
Seattle, Washington 98104